UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,214	10/13/2005	Masanao Kamei	4710-0122PUS1	8978
	7590 09/24/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 374 22040 0747	SOROUSH, ALI		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/553,214	KAMEI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ALI SOROUSH	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 September 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	isideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c			10 100000 101
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		i be entered and an e.	kplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	, , , , , ,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 29 Under 25 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tetsuo et al. (EP Application 1065234 A2, Published 03/01/2001) in view of Nomura et al. (UK Patent Application 2138845 A, Published 10/31/1084) is maintained. Applicant has argued that Tetsuo et al. do not teach a silicone not altered by a surface treatment step, i.e. a free organopolsiloxane. In response to Applicant's argument it should be noted that the limitations on which applicant relies (i.e. free organopolysiloxane) are not stated in the claims. Therefore, it is irrelevant whether the reference includes those features or not. For the same reasons indicated above applicants affidavit as to the advantage of free organosiloxane over titanium dioxide powder surface treated with organosiloxane is not persuasive. Applicant further argues that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Tetsuo et al. with Nomura et al. since one is directed to cosmetics in general and other is directed to hair dye compositions. Applicant's argument has been considered but found not to be persusive. Nomura et al. teaches that after a 30 minute application of combined first and second lotion the hair is sufficiently washed with a composition comprising SDS and then with water. Tetsuo et al. teach that the composition cosmetic composition having powders with silicone surface treatment may have surfactants such as SDS and used as hairdressing products such as shampoo, rinse, and treatment. Therefore, one would have been motivated to use the shampoo composition of Tetsuo et al. for washing the hair after the hair dye treatment. For the foregoing reasons the instant rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.